	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Notice of Allowability	09/782,780	BOLLELLA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lilian Vo	2195	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS I herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8 NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.3	S (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this a 5) or other appropriate communication RIGHTS. This application is subject	pplication. If not included on will be mailed in due course. THIS	
1. This communication is responsive to 4/27/05.			
2. X The allowed claim(s) is/are 1, 5 - 7, 12 - 14 and 19 - 20 n	now renumbered as 1 - 9.		
3. X The drawings filed on 13 February 2001 are accepted by	the Examiner.		
<ul> <li>4. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority a)</li> <li>a) All b) Some* c) None of the:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have 1. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have 1. Certified copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have 1. Certified copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have 1. Certified copies not received:</li> </ul>	ve been received. ve been received in Application No.		
Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDON THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.		y complying with the requirements	
5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be sub- INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gi			
6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") more (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftspeen 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date  (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examine Paper No./Mail Date  Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in	erson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTC er's Amendment / Comment or in the  1.84(c)) should be written on the draw	Office action of vings in the front (not the back) of	
<ol> <li>DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the dep attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT</li> </ol>			
Attachment(s)		±	
1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Patent Application (PTO-152)	
2. Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No./Mail D	6. ☑ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date <u>05272005</u> .	
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No./Mail Date</li> </ol>			
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit		nent of Reasons for Allowance	
of Biological Material	9.  Other		
	SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100	Lilian Vo Examiner Art Unit: 2195	

Application/Control Number: 09/782,780 Page 2

Art Unit: 2195

#### **EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT**

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

- 2. Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Marcia Doubet, registration no. 40,999 on 5/27/05.
- 3. The application has been amended as follows:
  In the claims:
  - i) Delete claims 2-4, 9-11 and 16-18.
  - ii) Replace Claim 1:

Claim 1 (currently amended): A computer program product for improving scheduling of tasks, the computer program product embodied on one or more computer readable media for execution on a computer and comprising:

computer-readable program code for computing whether execution of a plurality of schedulable tasks is feasible, wherein each of the tasks has an associated cost and an associated deadline;

Art Unit: 2195

computer-readable program code for computing a task-specific maximum cost extension allowable for a subsequent execution of each task, wherein the maximum cost extensions for all the tasks, when taken together, allow the execution of the plurality of tasks to remain feasible and wherein the maximum cost extension allowable for each task is computed incrementally by using, for a first subsequent execution, a fixed percentage of the associated cost for the task to compute a revised cost and by using, for other subsequent executions, a fixed percentage of the revised cost for the task; and

computer-readable program code for using, upon determining that any of the schedulable tasks exceeds its associated cost during its subsequent execution, the maximum cost extension for that task as an upper limit on additional allowable execution time for the task.

#### iii) Replace Claim 5:

Claim 5 (currently amended): The computer program product according to Claim 1, wherein zero is used instead of the fixed percentage when computing the maximum cost extension, for a subset of the tasks, for the first subsequent execution.

## iv) Replace Claim 6:

Claim 6 (previously presented): The computer program product according to Claim 1, wherein the computer-readable program code for using further comprises:

Art Unit: 2195

computer-readable program code for alternatively using an amount of time remaining until the task's associated deadline as the upper limit on additional allowable execution time, when the time remaining is not greater than the maximum cost extension for the task.

## v) Replace Claim 7:

Claim 7 (currently amended): A system for improving scheduling of tasks, comprising:

at least one processor;

means for computing whether execution of a plurality of schedulable tasks by the at least one processor is feasible, wherein each of the tasks has an associated cost and an associated deadline;

means for computing a task-specific maximum cost extension allowable for a subsequent execution of each task, wherein the maximum cost extensions for all the tasks, when taken together, allow the execution of the plurality of tasks to remain feasible and wherein the maximum cost extension allowable for each task is computed incrementally by using, for a first subsequent execution, a fixed percentage of the associated cost for the task to compute a revised cost and by using, for other subsequent executions, a fixed percentage of the revised cost for the task; and

means for using, upon determining that any of the schedulable tasks exceeds its associated cost during its subsequent execution, the maximum cost extension for that task as an upper limit on additional allowable execution time for the task.

Application/Control Number: 09/782,780

Art Unit: 2195

vi) Replace Claim 12:

Claim 12 (currently amended): The system according to Claim 7, wherein zero is

Page 5

used instead of the fixed percentage when computing the maximum cost extension, for a

subset of the tasks, for the first subsequent execution.

vii) Claim 13:

Line 1, replace "8" with -- 7 --;

Replace claim 14: viii)

Claim 14 (currently amended): A computer-implemented method for improving

scheduling of tasks, comprising steps of:

computing whether execution of a plurality of schedulable tasks is feasible,

wherein each of the tasks has an associated cost and an associated deadline;

computing a task-specific maximum cost extension allowable for a subsequent

execution of each task, wherein the maximum cost extensions for all the tasks, when

taken together, allow the execution of the plurality of tasks to remain feasible and

wherein the maximum cost extension allowable for each task is computed incrementally

by using, for a first subsequent execution, a fixed percentage of the associated cost for the

task to compute a revised cost and by using, for other subsequent executions, a fixed

percentage of the revised cost for the task; and

Application/Control Number: 09/782,780 Page 6

Art Unit: 2195

upon determining that any of the schedulable tasks exceeds its associated cost during its subsequent execution, using the maximum cost extension for that task as an upper limit on additional allowable execution time for the task.

# ix) Replace claim 19:

Claim 19 (currently amended): The computer-implemented method according to Claim 14, wherein zero is used instead of the fixed percentage when computing the maximum cost extension, for a subset of the tasks, for the first subsequent execution.

x) Claim 20:

Line 1, replace "15" with -- 14 --;

4. Pursuant to MPEP 606.01, the title has been changed to read: -- SYSTEM FOR INCREMENTALLY COMPUTING THE MAXIMUM COST EXTENSION ALLOWABLE FOR SUBSEQUENT EXECUTION OF EACH TASK USING FIXED PERCENTAGE OF THE ASSOCIATED COST --

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lilian Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-3774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30am - 5pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/782,780

Art Unit: 2195

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist at 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lilian Vo Examiner

Art Unit 2195

Page 7

May 27, 2005

OF ORY CENTER 2100